REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed October 17, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Bilgrami is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on December 23, 2008. Proposed amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. It appears that the proposed amendments overcome the rejections based on the cited art.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15, 18-25, 28-33, 36-38, 40-42, 47, 49-51, 53, 56, 57, 59, and 60 are pending in the present application. Specifically, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-12, 18, 25, 28, 29, 36, 37, 40, 47, 49-51, and 56 have been currently amended without introduction of new material; claims 5, 6, 13, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 31, 33, 38, 41, 42, and 53 are original claims; claims 21, 22, 30, 32, and 57 has been previously presented; claims 2, 8, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 34, 35, 39, 43-46, 48, 52, 54, 55, and 58 are canceled; and claims 59 and 60 are new claims that are submitted herein without introduction of new material. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 16 & 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are claiming "a modulated data signal" carrying computer executable instructions, which is non statutory. Appropriate correction is required

Response to the Rejection

Claims 16 and 34

Applicants have currently canceled claims 16 and 34 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 17, 35 and 39 are single means claims because in these claims, the "means" recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of the means, and is therefore subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F2d 712, 714-715, 21 8 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Response to the Rejection

Claims 17, 35, and 39

Applicants have currently canceled claims 17, 35, and 39 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been rendered moot as a result of cancellation.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub No 2003/0182447 A1) and Schneider et al (U.S. 2005/0235031A1)

Response to the Rejection

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully traverse the current rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103. However, in an effort to move forward prosecution in the case, Applicants have opted to amend the claim. As amended, the claim now recites in pertinent part: "*displaying a smart error page comprising a valid alternative URL obtained from at least one database of known URLs, wherein the at least one database of known URLs is a local copy of a portion of the Internet DNS URL*

database, the local copy updated dynamically for affirming the validity of the known URLs and

for generating <u>a blacklist of URLs to exclude socially undesirable domains.</u>" (Emphasis added).

As can be recognized from the recitation above, the claim now includes displaying of a
smart error page. This process is described in various parts of Applicants' original specification.
For example, Applicants' Figs. 6A-C show several examples of smart error pages. These figures
are described in detail in various sections of the specification.

The amended claim also recites a database that includes a blacklist of URLs. Applicants
have described certain details of the blacklist in various parts of their specification for example
in page 20, lines 1-3 and in page 22, lines 21-22.

At least the two features of amended claim 1 that are described above are neither taught
nor suggested in the cited references of Schilling and Schneider. In this matter, it may be
pertinent to point out that Schilling does describe an address correction prompt page (44) in his
paragraph [0023] and elsewhere. However, the prompted addresses are based on "*a root zone file
30, and a set of supplemental DNS entries for the pseudo TLDs*" (Schilling Fig. 2 and paragraph
[0018]).

In contrast to Schilling's use of pseudo top level domains (pseudo TLDs) that correspond
to "*mis-typed versions of one of the TLDs,*" Applicants utilize "*a local copy of a portion of the
Internet DNS URL database.*" The use of such a local database containing "safe" URLs is
explained in Applicants' specification, for example, in page 19, lines 24-29. The cited reference
of Schilling fails to teach or suggest such a database.

With reference to the second cited art, Schneider discloses how to generate hyperlink
references using a spell check program. However, Schneider fails to disclose a smart error page
(vis-à-vis an alternative URL) as recited in Applicants' claim 1, more so a smart error page
containing a valid alternative URL that has been obtained from a local copy of the Internet DNS
URL database.

In this regard it may be pertinent to point out that Schneider opts to use TLDs rather than
URLs for validating his generated hyperlinks. Towards this end, Schneider's paragraph [0026]
discloses that a "*word may be compared to a table of resolvable top level domains (TLDs).*"

Applicants respectfully submit that Schneider's process of verifying a generated hyperlink using a TLD table should not be confused with Applicants use of a URL database.

To elaborate, Schneider describes a TLD, in his paragraph [0012], as follows: *"Technically, the letters to the right of the "dot" (e.g., tut.net) are referred to as Top Level Domains (TLDs), while hosts, computers with assigned IP addresses that are listed in specific TLD registers are known as second-level domains (SLDs). For the domain name, "tut.net", ".net" is the TLD, and "tut" is the SLD."* Schneider further clarifies (in his paragraph [0011]) that in contrast to a TLD: *"A URL is the address of a file accessible on the Internet. The URL contains the name of the protocol required to access the resource, a domain name, or IP address that identifies a specific computer on the Internet, and a hierarchical description of a file location on the computer."* As pointed out above, Schneider teaches that a word may be checked against a table of TLDs, but fails to teach or suggest the use of a local database of URLs for providing a valid alternative URL as cited in Applicants' claim 1.

Furthermore, in addition to failing to teach Applicants' use of a URL database, Schneider also fails to teach or suggest another portion of Applicants' claim 1 pertaining to the local copy of the URL database as having a feature wherein the: *"local copy* (is) updated dynamically *for affirming the validity of the known URLs and for generating* a blacklist *of URLs to exclude socially undesirable domains"* (Emphasis added). Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that in addition to the shortcomings of the Schilling reference described above, the cited reference of Schneider also fails to teach several aspects of amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 (at least in amended form) is allowable over the cited references and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 3-7, 9-13, and 15

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-7, 9-13, and 15 are allowable by law arising from claim dependency on allowable claim 1. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claims 2, 8, 14, 16, 17 and 55

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 2, 8, 14, 16, 17 and 55 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim 18

Applicants respectfully traverse the current rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103. However, in an effort to move forward prosecution in the case, Applicants have opted to amend the claim. As amended, the claim now recites in pertinent part: "*displaying a smart error page comprising a) a suggested valid alternative URL, b) a partial search result comprising a name of a topic related to the invalid URL input, and c) a link that when asserted provides an extensive listing of search results related to the invalid URL input.*" Applicants have shown several examples of smart error pages in their figures 6A-C and described in their specification, certain features of these error pages such as a partial search result (615), and a link to a full-blown extensive listing of a search result (620).

The cited references of Schilling and Schneider, individually and/or combinedly, fail to teach or suggest such an error page that not only includes a valid alternative URL but also search topics related to an invalid URL entry. As illustrated in Applicants' figures, such search topics include: 1) related web sites (e.g. Fig. 6B shows "*Join an Astronomy Web Community*" that is a topic related to a mistyped "NASA" URL entry), and 2) a search home page ("MSN search").

In light of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 (at least in amended form) is allowable over the cited references and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 19-25, 28-33, and 56

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19-25, 28-33, and 56 are allowable by law arising from claim dependency on allowable claim 18. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claims 26, 27, 34, and 35

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 26, 27, 34, and 35 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim 36

Applicants respectfully traverse the current rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103. However, in an effort to move forward prosecution in the case, Applicants have opted to amend the claim. As amended, the claim now recites in pertinent part: "*determining from said local copy, availability of a website corresponding to said valid alternative URL; if the website is currently unavailable, displaying* a browser DNS error page *to indicate that a page cannot be displayed; and if the website is currently available, displaying* a smart error page *comprising said valid alternative URL.*" (Emphasis added).

Applicants have provided above, certain remarks pertaining to the "smart error page." As for the "browser DNS error page" part of the amended claim, Applicants have described this aspect in various parts of their original specification. For example, attention is drawn to page 22, lines 14-16, which states: "*In one embodiment, after traversing the suggestion rules table, if there are not enough suggestions, a straight URL spellcheck is conducted. In case of a purportedly valid site being down, the feature is turned off and a browser DNS error page, such as error page 15 is displayed.*" Error page 15 is a prior art error page that is shown in Applicants' Fig. 1.

At least the aspects of amended claim 36 that are described above are neither taught nor suggested in the cited references of Schilling and Schneider. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 is allowable over the cited references and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Claims 37, 38, 57, 59 and 60

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 37, 38, 57, 59 and 60 are allowable by law arising from claim dependency on allowable claim 36. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 39

Applicants have opted to cancel claim 39 and respectfully submit that the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim 40

Applicants respectfully traverse the current rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103. However, in an effort to move forward prosecution in the case, Applicants have opted to amend the claim. As amended, the claim now recites in pertinent part: "*means for displaying an error page containing a valid alternative URL that is obtained by said server from a local copy of a portion of the Internet DNS URL database, the local copy comprising* a block list for blocking the use of undesirable domains." (Emphasis added).

Applicants have described certain details of pertaining to a safe URL database (i.e. a local copy containing a "block list" as cited in amended claim 40), in various parts of their specification, for example in page 20, lines 1-3 and in page 22, lines 21-22. The use of such a database is neither taught nor suggested in the cited references. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 is allowable over the cited references and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim. **Claims 41, 42, 47, 49-51, and 53**

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 41, 42, 47, 49-51, and 53 are allowable by law arising from claim dependency on allowable claim 40. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claims 43-46, 48, 52, 54, and 58

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 43-46, 48, 52, 54, and 58 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15, 18-25, 28-33, 36-38, 40-42, 47, 49-51, 53, 56, 57, 59, and 60 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative.

Date: January 15, 2009   /Joseph F. Oriti/
                                                Joseph F. Oriti
                                                Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439